

REMARKS

Consideration and allowance of claims 18-26 of the subject application are respectfully requested.

First Rejection Under 35 USC 103

Claims 18-22, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over US 6,235,660 to Bhattacharjee et al (hereafter the '660 patent) in view of US 6,159,421 to Fujii (hereafter Fujii).

The Examiner offers the '660 patent to show the desirability that cleanroom wipes should emit as few particles as possible. However, the Examiner admits that the '660 patent does not teach the class of cleanroom in which the nonwoven fabric is used. The Examiner then offers Fujii for the disclosure of Class 10 cleanrooms, but Fujii does not address the use of nonwoven fabrics in a Class 10 cleanroom. In fact, there is no mention of nonwoven fabrics at all in Fujii. Further, at column 9, lines 27-30 of Fujii, which is cited by the Examiner, the reference is only to a localized Class 10 zone (not a nonwoven fabric) used in a Class 10,000 cleanroom. There is clearly no motivation to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention; therefore a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Second Rejection Under 35 USC 103

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the '660 patent in view of Fujii as applied to claim 18, above and further in view of US 6,189,189 to Morin et al (hereafter, Morin).

Considering that it was shown above that a prima facie case of obviousness was not established, the citing of Morin is not relevant as it relates to the patentability of dependent claim 25.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Third Rejection Under 35 USC 103

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the '660 patent in view of Fujii as applied to claim 18, above and further in view of US 5,807,870 to Beaty et al (hereafter, Beaty).

Considering that it was shown above that a prima facie case of obviousness was not established, the citing of Morin is not relevant as it relates to the patentability of dependent claim 23.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing is a complete response to the subject Office Action. Applicant believes that all rejections have been overcome and that the instant claims are now in condition for allowance. If any matters remain for resolution, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



FREDERICK D. STRICKLAND
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
Registration No.: 39,041
Telephone: (302) 892-7940
Facsimile: (302) 892-7343

Dated: October 24, 2003
FDS:fgl